

4 of 4 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2004 FDCH e-Media, Inc.  
(f/k/a Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.)  
FDCH Political Transcripts

March 3, 2004 Wednesday

**TYPE:** COMMITTEE HEARING

**LENGTH:** 13797 words

**COMMITTEE:** DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE

**SUBCOMMITTEE:** SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

**HEADLINE:** U.S. SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK) HOLDS HEARING ON FY2005 APPROPRIATIONS

**SPEAKER:**

U.S. SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK), CHAIRMAN

**LOCATION:** WASHINGTON, D.C.

**WITNESSES:**

LES BROWNEE, ACTING SECRETARY, UNITED STATES ARMY  
GENERAL PETER SCHOOMAKER, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY  
LIEUTENANT GENERAL RON HELMLY, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE  
LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROGER C. SCHULTZ, DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD  
LIEUTENANT GENERAL JERRY L. SINN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, UNITED STATES ARMY  
BRIGADIER GENERAL GUY C. SWANN III, CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON, UNITED STATES ARMY

**BODY:**

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
DEFENSE HOLDS A HEARING ON FY 2005 ARMY APPROPRIATIONS

MARCH 3, 2004

**SPEAKERS:**

U.S. SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK)  
CHAIRMAN  
U.S. SENATOR THAD COCHRAN (R-MS)  
U.S. SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER (R-PA)  
U.S. SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM)  
U.S. SENATOR CHRISTOPHER (KIT) BOND (R-MO)  
U.S. SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL (R-KY)  
U.S. SENATOR RICHARD C. SHELBY (R-AL)  
U.S. SENATOR JUDD GREGG (R-NH)  
U.S. SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON (R-TX)  
U.S. SENATOR CONRAD BURNS (R-MT)

U.S. SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE (D-HI)  
RANKING MEMBER  
U.S. SENATOR ERNEST F. HOLLINGS (D-SC)

U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD (D-WV)  
U.S. SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY (D-VT)  
U.S. SENATOR TOM HARKIN (D-IA)  
U.S. SENATOR BYRON DORGAN (D-ND)  
U.S. SENATOR RICHARD DURBIN (D-IL)  
U.S. SENATOR HARRY REID (D-NV)  
U.S. SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-CA)

\*

STEVENS: I apologize for being late. Presiding over the Senate involved — got too many things, scheduled these days.

Today we're going to receive the testimony from the acting secretary of the Army and the chief of staff on the Army's fiscal year 2005 budget request.

Secretary Brownlee, we welcome you for the first time before our committee. We look forward to hearing your plans to modernize the Army.

You're no stranger to this Senate or to the committee, even though you were on the other committee. We're pleased to welcome you back, as a friend and a colleague.

And General Schoomaker, we welcome you to our committee, look forward to working with you in coming years. And I thank you again for making the trip, the long trip to Alaska for the military appreciation dinner there. It's very important to our people.

The Army is now well on its way towards the future with its transformation plans. We're at war. And this transformation for our future course is continuing. It's a huge undertaking to do both at the same time.

We're also conducting a global war on terrorism, the war in Iraq. Ongoing activities in Afghanistan and now Haiti.

We're constantly reminded of the need for a strong, modern, prepared Army. And it's important today as it ever was, more important probably, to have a military which has the resources it needs and the support of the president and the entire country.

Today you're deployed all over the globe. We have 320,000 soldiers deployed or stationed forward, I'm informed.

The Guard and Reserve are also sharing this burden, with more than 100,000 reservists and guardsmen mobilized and on active duty. The total force is a reality now.

There are many important issues facing the Army. One of the most critical decisions Congress will make this year is how to help the Army reorganize and equip itself for future threats.

I believe we have demonstrated to the Congress, the country, that the transformation concept is not simply a new weapons platform but a new doctrine, a new organizational concept for the Army. And it's a whole new way for the Army to fight and win wars.

We appreciate your combined commitment to the Army, and your willingness to serve to ensure that the Army remains on the right course. It's the intention of this committee to give you the support you need to achieve your goal of modernization.

My distinguished friend from Hawaii is not here this morning because he's sharing another committee. He will be here soon. We do have other senators.

Any of you have an opening statement to make before we listen to the general, the secretary.

Senator Shelby?

SHELBY: Mr. Chairman, I ask that my opening statement be made part of the record (OFF-MIKE).

STEVENS: Senator Hutchison?

HUTCHISON: Mr. Chairman, I will also make mine a part of the record. But I agree with what you have said.

We do have boots on the ground in two very dangerous places. And our own homeland is also now a focus for attack.

So the Army is the one that is out there, obviously Guard and Reserve. I will be interested in hearing how you're going to handle the fatigue of the Guard and Reserve and ramp up our active duty forces, which you have already addressed publicly, but we hope to hear more about, and how you would finance that.

So you have a huge job and we are here to support you in every way. Thank you.

STEVENS: I apologize, Senator Dorgan. Do you have an opening statement?

DORGAN: (OFF-MIKE)

STEVENS: Without objection.

Senator Cochran, do you have any opening statement?

COCHRAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not.

STEVENS: Gentlemen, we're prepared to listen to your testimony and welcome you here. We all have an enormous task to ensure that you have the funds and the authority you need to keep this modernization going.

So, Secretary Brownlee?

BROWNLEE: Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today, along with my good friend and fellow graduate of the University of Wyoming ROTC program, the chief of staff of the United States Army, General Pete Schoomaker.

General Schoomaker and his family made a very difficult decision last summer to leave quite a comfortable and lucrative retirement to come back and rejoin the Army. And the Army is benefiting in an enormous way from his marvelous leadership.

And I'm especially honored to appear alongside this great soldier today. And I'm honored to work alongside him every day.

And I could not measure what he's brought to the Army. He brought a new meaning to the word (inaudible), and he's revitalized the spirit of our soldiers with his emphasis on the soldier's creed and the warrior ethos.

So, it's a great honor for me to be here before the committee representing the magnificent soldiers of our Army long with the chief of staff.

We have a prepared posture statement, Mr. Chairman, and with your permission we'd like to submit that statement for the record.

STEVENS: We automatically submit all statements for the record in this committee.

BROWNLEE: Let me begin by expressing my gratitude for your tremendous support to our soldiers who are serving our country around the world, as well as to their families at home. This support comes from the members, as well as from your dedicated professional and personal staff.

Your interest and involvement in the Army's activities has made a significant difference in our soldiers' welfare and their mission accomplishment.

So to the members and staff of this very distinguished committee, on behalf of the United States Army, thank you all for what you've done.

I know you're deeply interested in the great work our soldiers are doing, their training and their morale, and how we are equipping them. In the last nine months I've visited our troops in Iraq three times, and those in Afghanistan twice, and traveled to outposts in Germany, South Korea, and here in the United States.

I'm grateful to have the opportunity to share what I've learned with you. Underlying everything we are doing and are planning to do is the most important point I want to make here today, and that is that we are an Army at war serving a nation at war.

To better cope with the demands of this war, we propose to grow the Army temporarily about 30,000 soldiers over the next several years, using the authority provided in Title 10, and to be paid for from supplemental appropriations. We

will plan to use these resources to stand up at least 10 new combat brigades over the next several years, and ask for your support in this endeavor.

We're also restructuring our active and reserve forces to meet the challenges of today, and to more effectively use the resources that Congress and the American people have entrusted to us. This is an ongoing process, and we will keep the Congress well-informed.

Let me comment on a matter of great importance to the senior leadership of the Army: sexual assaults on soldiers by fellow soldiers. Such attacks not only weaken unit cohesion and lessen combat power, they are wrong, they will not be overlooked, and they will not be tolerated.

The Army's committed to identifying and holding accountable those who commit such actions, as well as committed to providing proper care for the victims of such attacks. We're dedicated to creating an environment and a command climate where these young women feel free to report these incidents through multiple venues: the chain of command, medical channels, chaplains and their peers.

We will properly care for those who have been assaulted, and investigate and take appropriate action against those perpetrating these crimes. It is the right thing to do, and we are going to do it.

Many of you have asked about measures we're taking to protect our forces in Iraq. I would like to address two in particular.

First, the number of up-armored Humvees in the CENTCOM area of responsibility is now over 2,000, compared to about 500 last spring. When General Schoomaker and I testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in November, we estimated then that we would be unable to satisfy the CJTF-7 requirement of 3,000 up-armored Humvees until May of 2005.

This was unacceptable. We worked with industry to steadily increase production of these vehicles, and we will now reach a production level of over 4,000 vehicles by August of 2004. We will ramp up from 185 vehicles this month up to 220 by May, and continue to increase until we reach our requirement.

I've talked to the CEOs of the companies that build these up-armored Humvees and boosted their production lines. They are committed to and capable of increasing production rates to up to 450 per month to help us fill our requirement even faster. While this will require additional resources, we are working within the Army budget and with OSD so that we can achieve this accelerated production level as quickly as possible.

Second, there has been concern about every soldier having the best available protection against bullets and (inaudible) fragments. To provide this protection, we increased the production of Interceptor body armor last year, and are currently producing and shipping 25,000 sets monthly to the theater of operations.

There are now sufficient stocks of Interceptor body armor to equip every soldier and DOD civilian in Iraq and Afghanistan. And we will fill our requirement for the remainder of the soldiers and DOD civilians in theater by the end of this month.

In summary, we are producing enough body armor so that all soldiers now located in the theater will be issued a set of body armor either before they deploy into Iraq or immediately after arrival in Afghanistan.

The Army provides relevant and ready (inaudible) land power to combatant commanders as a part of the joint force. To better do this we are transforming the Army itself in response to lessons learned and experiences gained by the Army's recent two and a half years of combat in the global war on terror, as well as the operational environments envisioned in the foreseeable future.

Last Monday, General Schoomaker and I announced the termination of the Comanche helicopter program as part of a major restructuring and revitalization of Army aviation. In lieu of completing development and procuring the 121 Comanche helicopters in the fiscal year '05 and fiscal year '11 Future Year's Defense Plan, we will propose to reallocate these resources to procure almost 800 new aircraft for the active and reserve components.

As a part of our total program over the FYDP, we will also enhance, upgrade and modernize over 1,400 aircraft in our existing aviation fleet. This program to revitalize Army aviation reflects the changed operational environment, and will provide the modularity and flexibility we must have to achieve the joint and expeditionary capabilities that are so essential to the Army's role now and in the future.

The fiscal year '05 president's budget we submitted, when amended to reflect the termination of Comanche, represents a balanced consideration of both our current and long-term requirements, and provides our Army with the resources we need, excluding war-related costs.

The tempo of our current operations is high, and has human and material costs. We appreciate the assistance of the Congress in addressing these issues as we work to restore our units and equipment to the high levels of readiness necessary to continue to meet our obligations to the nation.

In all that the Army has accomplished, and all that it will be called upon to do, the American soldier remains the single most important factor in our success.

Today our soldiers are present in over 120 countries around the world, representing the American people and American values with courage and compassion. I want to express my appreciation for the service and the enormous sacrifices made by our soldiers, especially those who have given the last full measure, and their families, as we meet the challenges and risk posed by the war on terror.

Our deepest thanks go to the members of our active and reserve component units, as well as to the thousands of Department of the Army civilians who are deployed overseas in harm's way.

Regardless of where our soldier serve, they perform as the professionals they are with skill, courage, compassion and dedication.

They embody the values of our Army and our nation serving selflessly and seeking only to do what must be done before returning home.

Despite remarkable successes, our fight is far from over. It will take time to win the war on terror. Our enemies are resolute, but hardline Al Qaida operatives in Iraq recognize they cannot dislodge our forces by fear or intimidation.

Our commitment to prevail in Iraq and elsewhere is unshakable. I have seen the resolution in our soldiers' eyes and heard the determination in their voices.

We must do our part to ensure they have all they need to do the job we have set before them. When the American people, and our leaders, stand behind them they can do any task on Earth.

We are transforming the Army while retaining the values critical to the Army's achievements of the past 228 years. The FY '04 defense legislation and supplemental appropriations have enabled the Army to do that which it has been asked to do. And I look forward to discussing with you how the fiscal year '05 budget request will permit us to continue meeting our obligations now and in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to thank you and the members of this distinguished committee for your continuing support of the men and women in our Army, an army at war, and a full member of the joint team employed in fighting terror around the world. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

STEVENS: Thank you very much.

Our co-chairman has arrived.

Senator Inouye, do you have an opening statement?

INOUE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do, and I ask that my full statement be made part of the record.

But before I do I'd like to join you in welcoming General Schoomaker and the secretary of the Army because this is their first time before us. And I can assure you that it will be a — I won't say a happy time, but we are good people.

I'd like to join my secretary in expressing our, I would say, our admiration and our gratitude to the men and women who have stood in harm's way in our behalf since 9/11. And I commend everyone who has played an important role in these operations.

Time and time again the extraordinary ability of our men and women in uniform, and all the people who work to support them, has been demonstrated. Now I can speak for everyone here, we are extremely proud of our fellow Americans.

Thank you very much, sir.

STEVENS: Thank you, Senator.

General Schoomaker, do you have a comment to make?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I'd like to make just a few brief comments if I might.

Chairman Stevens, Senator Inouye, thank you very much for the opportunity to join Secretary Brownlee before you today and talk about our great Army.

I'd like to reciprocate and recognize the great service of Secretary Brownlee, who's acting secretary of the Army. He had a very distinguished military career of his own, two tours in Vietnam, wounded, recognized and awarded for valor on the battlefield. And of course, you're all aware also served with distinction here as a staffer in this body in the Senate.

And he certainly is a great partner, as we go forward with the great challenges that we had to force as we transform the Army while we are engaged in the global war on terrorism, and engaged all over the world.

I'd also like to recognize Lieutenant General Ron Helmly, who's with us today. He heads the U.S. Army Reserve. And Lieutenant General Roger Schultz, to my left here, who heads the Army National Guard.

And we are one. We are a total army, we are together. There's no daylight between us in what we're trying to achieve here. And I think you'll see as we talk about what we're doing that we are approaching this as a unified body moving forward to the 21st century.

I'd also like to recognize the great pride I have in be able to serve once again in uniform with the men and women of the United States Army. And this includes their families, and includes the great civilians that we have that do so much to support our army at war.

Finally, I'd like to reinforce something that Secretary Brownlee has said. And that is that we're moving now with a great deal of vigor and momentum. And we are trying to take advantage of the silver lining in this cloud of worldwide war operations and being at war.

And we are trying to transform the Army using momentum of the Army as we reset it for continuous operations. We don't reset it to the Army it was before, but we reset it to the Army of the future.

And we see this as an extraordinary window of opportunity to take advantage not only of the great resources that this Congress and this committee has provided to our Army, but also take advantage of the motion that the Army's in.

And it is a narrow window of opportunity, and perhaps one of my greatest fears is that we don't take full opportunity here of this window, and allow ourselves to come to rest and not complete the transformation that we feel is so necessary.

We have taken some extraordinary steps, and one of them of course is as we looked at Army aviation we found a solution in the fact of terminating Comanche. I can assure you we did not start out with an attitude to terminate Comanche. But it made such sense, from a business position as being a fiscally responsible thing to do; also, that the operational trades made so much sense.

And I would ask your support for these kinds of initiatives, to ensure that the commitment that we were able to obtain from the secretary of defense, from the White House and from OMB, that these resources would be committed to fixing Army aviation as we do it.

And I would tell you that in this particular case, it's not just the extraordinary number of helicopters we're going to buy and the amount of upgrades and modernization that we're going to do with our existing fleet, but it also includes the MILCON; it includes fixing the ammunition, like rockets and Hellfire issue, which is of great concern to me; the simulators; the training base; UAVs; and the future tech base for a future joint rotorcraft solution for 2020, 2025.

So it's a far-reaching approach that we're taking. And I would very much appreciate your support with this because I know that there's a great deal of interest in how we're going to accomplish all of this.

And having said that, sir, I stand with the secretary of the Army here in his statement. And we submitted our posture statement for the record. And I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

STEVENS: Thank you very much. We anticipate approximately 10 members coming to join in this hearing. So

unless there's objection, limit original round to five minutes apiece.

I want to start off by congratulating the two of you for the Comanche decision. This committee had to a decision once before, a similar decision on the Sergeant York.

You made the decision, I think, clearly and with a succinct statement. So from my point of view, I intend to support your efforts and will honor the commitments been made, that the funds that will be redirected from the Comanche will stay with Army aviation, where the need is very great.

But can you tell us, is there going to be a gap now in Army helicopter procurement because of this?

SCHOOMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the answer is no. In fact, as you know, we were not going to achieve delivery of Comanche until later within this future year defense program. There were 121 Comanches in the program at the time.

The counterbalance is that we're going to be significantly upgrading the current fleet, bringing, for instance, Apache up to Block 3, which gives us the same capability with the exception (inaudible) ability as Comanche Block 1 was going to provide us.

And what, in effect, we are doing, I believe, we will achieve a greater industrial base capacity that, in effect, is going to give us very positive results on our readiness on the aviation fleet.

We see this as a win-win situation all the way across. And I think it will give us immediate assistance here in maintaining the readiness of our aviation.

STEVENS: Well, I'm going to ask for your cooperation by having a classified session on the total subject of the helicopter transition at a later date, as I think some of the questions might not be appropriate in an open session.

We discussed informally the question of what's going to happen to this increased strength you have now and your plans for forming separate brigades from those and transitioning them into the regular Army as you downsize other units. Could you explain that for us here this morning?

BROWNLEE: Sir, I might let Pete start out with what we need to do, and then I could pick up and explain some of the how for that.

STEVENS: Yes, please.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, thank you very much.

This is a total Army switch to modularity. And what we are talking about doing is maintaining 10 divisions on the active force and eight divisions in the National Guard, for a total of 18 division battle command headquarters.

We then want to expand the number of brigades. On the active Army side we want to go from 33 active brigades that we currently have, to a minimum of 43 — that's an increase of 30 percent — with the possibility of going to 48.

We have an off-ramp at 2006 to make that decision to see how we're doing and what the affordability is.

But we believe that by going from 33 to 43 brigades, which is the equivalent of almost three divisions of fighting strength within the 10 division formation, that it will help us greatly.

At the same time we are going to be transforming the Army National Guard, under its (inaudible) division headquarters (inaudible) 34 brigade size units. This, in effect, gives us an army of somewhere between 77 and 82 brigade combat teams, which is, in fact, the answer to relieving the stress to the force.

This gives us a broader base that we get greater dwell time between deployments and rotations. And we believe that we can do this within the current authorized statutory end-strength numbers.

We would ask for a temporary growth, not in statutory end-strength, but a temporary growth in the Army under the authorities that the president has in Title 10, that the law gives him, for us not to use stop-loss, stop-move to grow the Army, but to actually be able to recruit, train and organize through the pipeline, on a temporary basis, this additional 30,000 soldiers to create these brigades.

Simultaneously, we believe that we can find efficiencies through some of the global force reposturing, military-to-civ conversions, and other efficiencies that we have that will offset that temporary growth, so that we can let the air out of the tires and come back down to our end-strength, retaining the brigades that we formed. And I'll let Secretary Brownlee

discuss the specifics of that.

BROWNLEE: (OFF-MIKE)

(UNKNOWN): Secretary Brownlee, could you turn your microphone on?

BROWNLEE: I'm sorry, I apologize, sir. I hope that came across.

STEVENS: I just thought my ears were acting up again.

(LAUGHTER)

BROWNLEE: Sir, as one with very bad ones, I should know better, I apologize.

STEVENS: I do hope we can keep the comments, responses a little more succinct so that we can have more than one question per senator.

But one thing I failed to do, would you identify for the record the general officers that have accompanied you, General Schoomaker?

I think sometimes we fail to recognize they're here, and they're your support. So I'd like to have it in the record who's here.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I recognized Lieutenant General Ron Helmly from the U.S. Army Reserve, and Lieutenant General Roger Schultz from the far left, from the Army National Guard. General Helmly is sitting right here in the middle.

Lieutenant General Jerry Sinn who is out of our budget office. He's our counsel on money, a very good one. And I think you know General Guy Swann behind us, who our legislative liaison.

STEVENS: Thank you very much.

Senator Inouye?

INOUE: If I may follow up with the chairman's question. Are the new brigades going to be a permanent part of the force?

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir.

INOUE: But however, if I recall Dr. Zakheim yesterday, he indicated that these new brigades will be phased out after the war in Iraq. Is that correct?

SCHOOMAKER: No, sir. The 30,000 temporary end-strength will be phased out after the emergency. And they will be offset by the efficiencies we find within our current statutory end-strength during the period that we're doing this transformation.

INOUE: But not the new brigades?

SCHOOMAKER: No, sir. They stay. They remain.

INOUE: Secretary, and general, with the strain of our about deployed forces, there's something said among about recruiting and retaining. And I suppose that should be a concern of all of us. Are you confident that you can meet your goals without changing any standards in recruiting or retention?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. Right now, sir, I'd describe as cautiously optimistic where we are on all of this.

We certainly are concerned within the Army because we do have very high OPTEMPO, the Army is very busy. This impacts on soldiers and their families.

Right now with respect to recruiting we're confident that we're going to make our goals. We're running a little below the line in some of them, but for most of them it looks like we're going to make all our fiscal year '04 requirements.

We have some concerns in retention in some spots. But in other areas we're doing very well. So we're going to concentrate on those.

We have a lot of authority that's been provided by the Congress to take certain measures to allow us to provide



incentives, which we will do when it appears time to do that. And we've already used some of them on reenlistment bonuses and other authorities that have been provided for those things.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I'd like to add very briefly, we were extraordinarily successful last year in meeting over 100 percent of our retention and recruiting goals across all components. This year it looks like we're on track right now to exceed 100 percent in recruiting across the components.

We do have a few retention challenges, but everybody is very confident we will make them.

And I would like to make a very strong comment here that we must relieve the stress on this force. And we believe our plan is designed to do that, because we cannot rely on this extraordinary level of commitment, sacrifice and patriotism to carry us at the level that we are currently operating.

And that's why I feel it's so important that we use this extraordinary window of opportunity to transform this Army to a broader brigade base, to be able to achieve the kind of (inaudible). We anticipate we'll be able to create a force that will be able to sustain this level of effort we have today, with an active force location scheme of one year in three, and with the reserve components one year in five or six rotation, which we think is sustainable.

INOUE: I realize that the matter of policy is not within your jurisdiction. But like all of us, you read the papers here, receive briefings and such. And there are potential hot spots throughout the world: Korean peninsula, Indonesia, Malaka Straits, the Middle East, just to name a few, Pakistan, India.

Are you in your planning stage at least considering expanding the military, if we find ourselves having to involve ourselves in all these activities?

BROWNLEE: Sir, as I indicated, in plans that we have within the Army are to increase the number of combat brigades. That will give us additional capability in case we have to respond to something else.

Our primary intent right now, as General Schoomaker said, to relieve the stress, current stress, on the force. If there is another emergency elsewhere, this clearly would give us more capability and flexibility in responding to that.

SCHOOMAKER: I think, again, this is a baseline. Today we have 33 brigades in the active force. And we have 15 enhanced separate brigades in the National Guard that we consider available and ready to go in a rapid way.

If we complete our transformation we could have as many as 82 brigades available to us in real combat power, within our current statutory end-strength. And this is what this transformation is taking us to. It'll be between 77 and 82 brigade combat teams across the Army active component and National Guard.

INOUE: You can have 82 brigades without changing the end-strength?

SCHOOMAKER: That's correct, sir.

INOUE: Thank you, sir.

STEVENS: Senator Shelby?

SHELBY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Brownlee, (OFF-MIKE) What about the OSD and White House commitment here. Are they committed to Army aviation in the future, which I think is very important that this savings be spent there. I think General Schoomaker referenced that clearly. Do you want to comment on that?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I...

SHELBY: Yes, go ahead, General.

SCHOOMAKER: I personally received a commitment from Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz, the secretary of defense. I met in the Oval Office with the president and received his commitment. And we met with Josh Bolten in OMB and received their concurrence and commitment that we would apply the Comanche program, \$14.6 billion, to Army aviation.

SHELBY: It's very important to the future of the Army, isn't it?

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SHELBY: The Army reset program — General Schoomaker, a lot of us are concerned about the health of the Army's combat equipment. We've talked about this before, especially combat vehicles, what's been going on in Iraq.

\$1.5 billion was included in the supplemental last year for the Army depot maintenance. Yet we understand that the Army Tank and Automotive Command currently has a backlog of roughly the same amount.

How much funding has the Army received from '04 supplemental for reset? What's the readiness level of the units that have returned and units still deployed in Iraq? You want to...

(CROSSTALK)

SHELBY: You want to do that for the record...

BROWNLEE: Sir, I've have to provide for the record the exact amount of funding we received out of the supplemental for resetting the force. But we do have funds to recapitalize, reset, all of the major systems that we have bought back right now, I believe. And we are proceeding to do that.

SHELBY: But you got to have sufficient resources to...

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, you're exactly right. And I am, again, with the same people, both the secretary and I are on the record.

We are going to require supplemental funding to reset the Army two years beyond the end of this emergency, which is consistent with what it took us to reset the Army following Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

We have over 9,000 pieces of rolling stock that were used and consumed and require repair just from OIF 1, from the war...

(CROSSTALK)

SHELBY: We got to get that through the depots, have we not...

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir. And that's who's going to have to do this work. Some of it's going to have to be done forward, some of it is going to have to be done here.

SHELBY: General Schoomaker, regarding test management and diagnostic equipment. Not very much attention gets paid to test measurement and diagnostic equipment. But I would like to express concern about the Army's action in this bill to increase RDT&E funding for calibration sets equipment to decrease by 275 percent and to zero all procurement funding.

The loss of this funding for Calsets (ph) 2000, a lot of people believe negatively impacts two transformation imperatives that are important to you: modularity and commonality.

Do you have enough calibration sets in the force to meet immediate requirements? In other words what are we going to do here?

SCHOOMAKER: I believe we do, but we would need to provide that for the record, unless the secretary knows.

SHELBY: OK. Future combat systems, Secretary Brownlee. How is the FCS LSI team performing? Is technology development where you want it to be?

BROWNLEE: Sir, you know I get different reports from the people who are over watching that. They tell me that they're doing well.

I have to tell you that I've had some concerns about that. And so recently I wrote a letter to the Institute for Defense Analysis, and asked them to please examine the LSI relationship between the Army and the LSI contractor and to provide that report to the Army, just to be sure that that relationship is working as we intended from an independent point of view. So we'll get that, and that should be done in several months.

SHELBY: You'll let us know?

Could you talk about the Stryker vehicle performance in the setting in Iraq?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, I can. And I'm sure Pete would like to add to whatever I might say.

But we've been very pleased with the way it's performed in Iraq. We've had several vehicles that have been hit by RPGs that have survived in the way we intended.

And this was with an interim protective system, the SLAD armor that we put on it, which was an interim protective system. So far that's worked as intended.

The reports we get from the field are very good with respect to that vehicle. We're very pleased with it so far.

SHELBY: General?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I'm very pleased with the way Stryker has performed, not only as a vehicle, but as a system.

And the amount of infantry that's in Stryker is amazing in its lethality, its ability to network and move. As you know, we've just gotten a commitment and approval out of OSD to proceed with Stryker 5 and 6, so that completes Stryker.

And as we move forward...

SHELBY: That's a good endorsement too, isn't it?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, it is. And the improvements that are being made to Stryker along the lines of protection are significant. Currently it's the second-best protected system that we have, second to the M1 tank. And it will continue to improve, so we're very happy with what we see there.

SHELBY: Mr. Chairman, will we get another round?

STEVENS: (OFF-MIKE)

Following the early bird rule, next we recognize Senator Hutchison.

HUTCHISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think your concept is outstanding. And you said you were going to use stop-loss orders to keep the people as you are in your retraining process. How long do you anticipate those stop-loss orders will be?

BROWNLEE: We only stop-loss units that are alerted to be deployed, units that are deployed, and units that have immediately returned from deployment. This is to, as General Schoomaker said, stabilize that force, so that it stays together, trains as a team, deploys as a team and a unit, and fights that way.

HUTCHISON: And how long do you anticipate the stop-losses to last?

SCHOOMAKER: We stop-loss from alert up to 90 to 120 days upon return. But you might have misunderstood me here.

Our temporary end-strength — our temporary growth that we've asked for above end-strength is not stop-loss. We don't want to use stop-loss for that. We want to recruit and specifically target where those go.

So we will continue to use stop-loss for those units that are specifically going to war, to hold them together. And we do that very carefully. I mean we recognize what stop-loss is.

But if you take a look at our other initiatives, which is force stabilization, as we move to modularity and stabilize the force it will reduce our requirement to have to use stop-loss.

HUTCHISON: I understand. Let me ask you this. Are you going to be able to show fairly quickly a relief to Guard and Reserve deployments?

SCHOOMAKER: I think you know we've just alerted three more brigades in the division headquarters for OIF 3. And we've done it early to provide the predictability and the time so that people are not being rushed as has been necessary in the past.

But again, the more of these brigades we can create on the active side — that's why we've asked to do the 10 brigades in three years. We've already got one in the 3rd Infantry Division. They've already reset into a four-brigade division.

We're going to do two more this year. We'll do three or four next year. And the residual three or four the third year.

The faster we can achieve that, the less we're going to have to — the more relief we can give to calling the Guard. As long as we're at this level of effort. If this level of effort reduces, of course, the requirement for the National Guard will reduce commensurately.

HUTCHISON: Do you have a long-term goal on how long you would ask a member of Guard and Reserve to activate during the term that they signed up to serve?

SCHOOMAKER: We are working very hard to reduce the amount of post-mobilization training requirements in the Guard. If we get into force stabilization and modularity, it will allow us to predict when we have to call — when a unit would be in the window of alert.

HUTCHISON: I understand that you're saying predictability is very important, and it is. But I'm also visiting our Guard and reserves in Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq and at home. And part of their frustration, as you know, is overdeployment. It's not just not being able to tell when they're going, it's going so much.

(CROSSTALK)

SCHOOMAKER: The path to relieve their frustration is the faster that we can get to this level. Because it's not only going to increase the dwell time between deployments. As I said, we could get, on the active side, one deployment in a three-year cycle.

On the Guard side we can get one deployment in a five-or six-year cycle in a predictable fashion. And our desire is to limit these deployments to six-month deployments, if we have to do it.

HUTCHISON: That's what I was after. Thank you very much.

STEVENS: Senator Dorgan's recognized.

DORGAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Secretary Brownlee and General Schoomaker, the National Guard and Reserve are being used in a manner that we have not previously anticipated. I think everyone agrees with that. I mean, we have Guard and Reserve in Iraq that have now been mobilized for 13 months, away from homes, families and jobs for 13 months, won't likely be home until May.

So that was certainly not anticipated. And we've had long discussions about that.

Let me ask, what is this doing to recruitment and retention? There's been some concern about recruitment and retention rates in the Guard and Reserve.

Can you give me information about that? I see General Schultz is here, and perhaps he has information about that as well.

BROWNLEE: In the National Guard, in fact, our retention rates I believe are running over 100 percent right now in the National Guard. Reserves are a little bit below the glide path that we would desire. We believe that we can get that up in order to meet our fiscal year '04 goals.

DORGAN: At this point then you are not concerned about, based on your experience and also looking forward, you're not concerned that the increased deployments are going to affect recruitment and retention?

BROWNLEE: Sir, I'm always concerned. I very much am.

I think this OPTEMPO certainly has human costs that we have to measure. And what we have told the Army staff is, we want to know when the light on the dashboard flickers amber so we can take measures and steps to try to get things under control.

What we want to avoid is having people come in and tell us when every light on the dashboard is red, and then we're in trouble. So that's the way we're trying to operate it.

But I wouldn't want to tell you we're not concerned. We are very concerned. And that's one reason that we've come forth with the initiative to grow the size of the Army to reduce the stress.

SCHOOMAKER: If I could, I may be the only person in the room that thinks it's extraordinary that we're calling the Guard and the Reserve. I think that's what they're for, and I think that the active Guard and Reserve are all volunteers.

Now, what is disappointing is that we're working — of the million people we have in uniform we're working too few of them too much. And part of what we have to do in our restructuring is distribute the load across the force. And that's what we're trying to do here.

But the Guard right now is leading in both recruiting and retention, in the Army, which is counterintuitive. But, in fact, and I'll let Roger verify, validate that if...

DORGAN: The reason I ask the question is it is counterintuitive. You would think — and I think it is extraordinary by the way.

SCHOOMAKER: It is.

DORGAN: I would not necessarily agree with you. It is extraordinary that we would call up a unit and they're gone 17 months, or in some case close to 18 months, from family, home and job. I mean I think in a couple cases only two years following a deployment to Kosovo.

So I mean I understand that's what the Guard and Reserve are for, but I think you've indicated in your testimony we need to be judicious about how often we deploy and how long we deploy, because they are citizen-soldiers.

Let me ask a question. You mentioned General Sinn, and we're very proud of General Sinn in North Dakota.

(LAUGHTER)

You indicated that he's keeping track of costs. I suspect that you're taking a look at what are the anticipated future costs here with respect to deployments.

And for reasons the chairman and others have discussed on the floor with me and others, that those costs are not included in the budget. But I would expect we will then pass a supplemental. We passed a \$60 billion supplemental for the military and we'll do that again.

But can you give us some sense of what kind of costs you're seeing and what kind of costs you're planning for that are not yet included in the budget, but that we will be confronted with with respect to a supplemental?

BROWNLEE: Sir, the cost of the operations, if you count all the costs to include the personnel costs, which maybe shouldn't be counted, but it runs for both Afghanistan and Iraq about \$4.5 billion a month. Most of that would be covered — is covered now by the supplemental that was previously passed.

The Army got roughly \$40 billion of, I believe, the \$65.1 billion that was provided by the Congress for military operations. And that's what we're using for that.

And we believe that certainly is adequate to take us to the end of this fiscal year. We may need some assistance from the administration, depending on whether, you know, the costs continue or increase. So that right now is where we see that.

DORGAN: Let me ask — my time is about expired — I want to ask one additional question. The Marines recently engaged in a contract to buy sets of what is called LAST ceramic armor for Humvees in Iraq.

And as I inquired about that, I understood the Marines determined the LAST armor is the quickest and most efficient way of protecting its vehicles, Humvees, after observing tests done by the Army.

Does the Army have plans to proceed in a similar fashion? Apparently it is ceramic armor for the doors of Humvees that the Marines have observed in testing that the Army did. And they decided to proceed to purchase.

(CROSSTALK)

DORGAN: I preceded my question by suggesting my time was about to expire. I finished my question, and if they have time to answer, I'd appreciate it.

BROWNLEE: So if we could take that for the record, I'd prefer not to address that in open session, if that's OK.

DORGAN: That'd be helpful. Thank you very much.

STEVENS: Senator Cochran is recognized.

COCHRAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

General Schoomaker, I understand the Army is in the midst of one of the largest troop rotations in history — well, since World War II anyway. And you pointed out that in this period of four months, from December to April, you'll have 110,000 troops deploying to the Iraq theater of operations and 120,000 returning.

That's quite a challenge. You said we're entering the most challenging period for the Army since World War II.

I wonder what you have done to help ensure the protection of those forces during the troop rotation and the logistical challenges that you face. Have you had enough equipment, airlift, sealift, support from the other forces or from the total force concept?

SCHOOMAKER: Sure, that's a great question. We in fact are moving over a quarter of a million people in those four months. We are moving on average 5,000 people in and out every day.

And the very close work we've done with Central Command, General Abizaid and his folks, to ensure the proper protection and operational security. And all of the things that are required there is extraordinary.

And the support we've had out of Transportation Command, General Handy and his folks, in managing this movement is extraordinary. And what I find to be particularly extraordinary is we're right now at the very peak of this, and it's been virtually seamless.

It's been very, very well done. And we're very proud of what the joint team has done to be able to pull this off. And we don't anticipate we'll have any problems in the future, because it's running very smoothly.

COCHRAN: We have a good number of reservists and guardsmen on duty around the world. I've been told that about 40 percent of the force in Iraq is made up of reservists and National Guardsmen.

I know we have 22 Guard and Reserve units from my state that are deployed to the theater. One of our groups over there is an Army National Guard aviation group from Tupelo, Mississippi.

They fly helicopters and when they were deployed they realized that they'd lost their helicopters to a Tennessee guard unit that had gone on before them. And they were anticipating some replacement helicopters.

These are challenges that I know you're facing. They've been dispersed among some other units so they can take advantage of their training and their capability of contributing to the mission there. But I'm sure the aircraft distribution challenge is something that you're looking into and trying to manage as well.

Do you have the replacement aircraft that you need, helicopters, for National Guard aviation units? Is there anything we can do in this budget cycle to help you overcome the deficits that you may face?

BROWNLEE: Sir, I appreciate the question, and I have looked into this. That unit of yours has performed remarkably, because we used them in a way that we would prefer not to. We had to use them almost as fillers for other units.

That's part of our reorganization of reserve components that we're going to address. We have too much force structure for the number of people we have, so when we call a unit up we have to take people from other units to fill those units up. And we want to reduce the number of units but not reduce the number of people so we can keep units filled. One point.

Second point is for the unit at Tupelo, they did lose their OH-58s, their Kiowas, to the Tennessee unit. Under the aviation plan that is being put together right now, it is yet undetermined whether they will receive Kiowa Warriors back in that unit or Apaches.

But that decision should be made soon. We'll make sure that you know as soon as we make that decision.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I'd like to just jump on that. You asked what can you do. Support the movement of the Comanche funding to the Army aviation modernization, because we're going to purchase 800 new aircraft, and upgrade 1,400, and that's for the active Guard and Reserve.

It makes the Guard and Reserve well in aviation. And that was a significant factor in making the decision to go this direction.

COCHRAN: In connection with force protection, we heard about the upgrading of the armor for Humvees. Is there a similar program under way for the Bradley fighting vehicles?

BROWNLEE: Sir, the Bradley fighting vehicle can be equipped with what we call reactive armor. We have some

reactive armor sets. We don't have enough for every Bradley in theater.

But the Bradley of course has the kinds of ballistic protection already inherent in its organic armor up and beyond that that the armored Humvee would have.

The reactive armor that we're talking about would provide additional protection from even more deadly weapons. And we don't normally put that on every Bradley, only on selected units.

COCHRAN: As part of the improvement of the helicopter and other aviation situation with the cancellation...

(CROSSTALK)

COCHRAN: I'd be glad to wait for another round. Thank you.

STEVENS: Senator Burns?

BURNS: Mr. Chairman, I have a statement I'll put in the record. I just have one question.

And by the way, I just want to state publicly now congratulations. Our visits to Iraq and Afghanistan have been very fruitful. And I want to congratulate your people, both leadership and the GIs that we've got on the ground.

They're doing a remarkable job under very difficult conditions, knowing that they are the target, and they're in a reactive position rather than an active position. And that's a tough way to do business in your business.

And the morale I found was high. But I was really impressed with the leadership of those young men and women that you have over there. And I want to congratulate you on that.

Now, that comes from an old Marine and it comes hard.

No, not really.

(LAUGHTER)

We've got 40 percent of our Guard in Montana deployed. And now we got notification of the 163rd Mechanized Infantry Regiment out of Bozeman, Montana, that's been put on alert. And there's some question about equipment.

I have worked very hard to build the infrastructure for training both in my Reserves and my Guard in Montana because whenever the move was made that a lot of our force structure was going to go into our citizen-soldiers, I made sure that they had, the Guard and Reserves had communications that was interactive for training. The facility was part of the recruitment and morale of the troops.

And I felt like the training had to be as good as what we're providing our soldiers on active duty. I'm just wondering about when they deploy. Now, some of the equipment is not up to what we find with our active duty personnel.

Will their equipment, such as the body armor — and I've got it written down here, HMMWV body armor — will that all be brought up to the same as active duty whenever they're deployed?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, we have equipped the Guard, the 38th, the 39th and the 81st that right now are in the motion for OIF to receive the top, the most modern body armor, equipment, helmets. What we call RFI, the Rapid Fielding Initiative. They receive it ahead of the active force. And we are now, of course, catching up with the active force.

But our intention and our commitment is to equip the Army at the top-level across the active, Guard and reserve. And to train, I mean to do what you're talking about uniformly across the force. And that is our initiative here as we go to modularity, stability, and do the kinds of things that we're talking about doing.

BURNS: That's good news. And also, when you integrate, they still got to be a part of a team. And they got to understand what position they play on the team so to speak. And I've been always concerned about that.

Under another — I'd like some sort of a briefing one of these days, whenever we get time, and I can either communicate this with Secretary Brownlee, but — deploying new technologies for detection and worrying about these roadside bombs and detection devices and stuff like that. Is DARPA — are you satisfied with the progress that DARPA's making in new technologies for detection?

BROWNLEE: Sir, we have within the Army an IED task force. I don't want to get into a lot of detail about what they're doing. But let me say that not just DARPA, but every agency that can help has been asked to help and has been

very forthcoming.

Let me just say that we're pleased with what this task force is doing and what they are accomplishing and what it looks like we can accomplish. And we'd be happy to provide that to you in a different session.

BURNS: Well, it looks like this is the wave of the future. And I think that's pretty important. And that's all the questions I have. And I want to congratulate the general on his boots.

(LAUGHTER)

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, those are Wyoming boots.

(LAUGHTER)

BURNS: That's what I thought. Are you as good a roper as the boots are?

SCHOOMAKER: I'm a half-decent roper. Are you a heeler (ph)?

(CROSSTALK)

SCHOOMAKER: I don't play golf. I do that.

BURNS: Good man.

STEVENS: The most important question is, do you fish, General?

(LAUGHTER)

STEVENS: We'll come to that later.

Tell us about the Future Combat System and what the status of that program is now, will you please?

BROWNLEE: Sir, let me say a little bit about the program. As you know, it is the Army's system-of-systems approach to equipping our future forces.

We intend to convert most of our heavy units to that, and maybe some others in the future.

Right now we are looking at an initial operational capability by 2010 and a full operational capability by 2012.

It is all in R&D development right now. And as I said, we have this approach with a lead system integrator, where the contractor works very closely with the Army in the development of these systems.

Do you want to comment on what (OFF-MIKE) to do with it? (inaudible)

SCHOOMAKER: I think the best statement is, is that we think we're going to fulfill, we've got confidence we're going to fulfill the Future Combat System. We're protecting the funding, we're moving forward on it. We're informing ourself with our current operations and spiraling things into Future Combat System. And we're trying to pull technologies as they're developed back into the current force.

So I look at the Future Combat System not as a destination, but as an effort every day as we move out there. And I'm fairly confident that we're going to do well there.

The biggest challenge we have in the Future Combat System, in my view, is the C4ISR, the battle command and the intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance aspects of that. Because it is a network, it's dependent on the network, and we must achieve the networkcentricity (ph) that's required for us to really optimize what the Future Combat System holds. And it will significantly improve our ability to operate as part of a joint team.

STEVENS: Gentlemen, I think I must take responsibility for the fact that there'll be no supplemental this year, in the balance of this fiscal year. We just spent too much time on those supplementals in the past.

And I had the CRS take a look at policies we've followed now since the Persian Gulf War. And those policies have been that in the initial periods of a war, an engagement overseas, we have followed the practice that the commander in chief takes money from the funds we've already made available for the Department of Defense and uses them in the conduct of that activity and then later comes in and asks for a supplemental, which repays the amounts that had been taken from the regular accounts, and then provides for the balance of the fiscal year for those activities, using the experience of the first quarter, quarter and a half of the new fiscal year to determine how much will really be needed for that fiscal year.



My question to you is, you haven't lived through those periods, but in terms of your judgment, as the Army bears the real brunt of this type of policy, has it in any way been harmed by that practice? Is it a practice we should abandon and ask for a supplemental now?

The budget will have at least \$30 billion indicated as being available for the supplemental sometime after the beginning of the next calendar year.

I want to know are you willing to go on the record and tell us whether this policy adversely affects the Army in its activities in the conduct of the war?

BROWNLEE: Yes sir, we've looked at this very carefully. And we believe with the funds we have in fiscal year '04, both in our budget and from the supplemental, that we can clearly get to the end of fiscal year '04. If we get in trouble, OSD has assured us they're able to help.

And beyond fiscal year '04, when we would have the funds available in the fiscal year '05 budget, we would be able to cash flow funds out of third and fourth quarter funds to help us in the first and second quarters. And if there are additional problems that might arise, we've checked with OSD and they believe the administration's capable of providing any other help we might need.

Which means we should be able to carry ourselves at least through the end of March next year, maybe a little beyond that. I wouldn't want to put a date on it, but at least until then. That's our best estimate.

STEVENS: That is the policy we followed in Kosovo, and Bosnia, and as a matter of fact in initiation of the Persian Gulf War.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

STEVENS: But there's been a request that we change that policy. You're confident that you can live with this policy in terms of this war?

BROWNLEE: Notwithstanding any emergencies that we don't see now, sir, we can.

STEVENS: General, and all your general officers, you lived — I'm going over the line a little bit longer — you lived through these other engagements. Was the Army inconvenienced in Bosnia or in Kosovo in that manner of funding of the operations overseas?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, not that I'm aware of. The only thing that I would say — and it's a little bit below the radar screen probably. But as you know there are anti-deficiency rules. And there are times when we could make better decisions if there were certainty of funding, in certain areas, that we may be able to not only anticipate better, but provide better fiscal management if we had the opportunity, you know, to do a little longer lead time on some things.

But in terms of the macro picture, and the big news, I am not aware of there having been a problem in that.

STEVENS: Senator Inouye?

INOUE: Thank you.

As you can imagine, as part of my work I try my very best to travel and meet and listen to men and women in uniform. And I find that there are two elements involved in the development of a combat soldier that's very important.

One is morale, naturally. And the other is the sense of belonging to a unit or something.

And so some years ago I began questioning these people. And to my surprise — I should not have been surprised — almost no one had ever heard of the 5th Regimental Combat Team made up of Puerto Ricans who served in World War II.

And when I tell that to Puerto Rican Americans, their eyes light up, and say, "My God, we had our men in there?"

With all the documentaries we've had about the members of the Army Air Corps, the Tuskegee Airmen, not too many Americans are aware of them. But when you tell them that this unit in protecting bombers never lost a single bomber, they're stunned. They're made up of men who were segregated, like the Puerto Ricans were segregated.

And then when I tell them that there was a Filipino regiment, a combat team sent to the Philippines just before December 7th, and they ended up the war with less than 800 men because they were left there by General MacArthur to serve as the basis of a guerrilla force, they're stunned.

And when I tell Hispanic-Americans that 17 of them have Medals of Honor, they can't believe it.

And so, Secretary, you and I have worked out something of a traveling exhibit, and we're going to send them all over the museums of the posts. I just want to know how's it coming along? The funds have been appropriated on that.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. Sir, I'll provide the answer for the record.

But to my knowledge, we're proceeding with that. I certainly support what you're doing. I think it will show a real benefit to the Army in recruiting. And we want to do that.

So I thank you for the idea, and I'll get you a detailed account of where we are.

INOUE: We have a lot of talk about human rights and civil rights. Integration began in the Army. That's the first place. It wasn't the Interior Department or any other department.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

INOUE: It was the Army.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. Sir, thank you for that.

INOUE: Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STEVENS: Senator Shelby?

SHELBY: Thank you.

I'd like to go back to the reset programs, the projections for it. It's my understanding from some of the depots that a plan to do this year for reset, the plans have not yet materialized, General.

In other words, projections for the reset workload at the depots continue to go down.

Is 1020 (ph) the standard our soldiers deserve in adequate overhaul, as a lot of people contend cannot be accomplished anywhere but in the depots? What is the real reset plan for the depots?

Mr. Secretary, you want to touch that?

BROWNLEE: Sir, we are using the depots now. You might be interested to know that in these depots, particularly the one in Anniston, we are using them to assist us in preparing armored kits...

SHELBY: I know.

BROWNLEE: ... for all the Humvees that are not up armored...

(CROSSTALK)

SHELBY: I was down there, I just saw what they're doing.

BROWNLEE: They are cutting steel, and putting together kits...

SHELBY: Very innovative.

BROWNLEE: ... to help us do that. And we are very appreciative of that. In fact we fly those over, that's how important that work is that they're doing...

SHELBY: What about the projected work on reset for the depots. It has not come forth yet. What's going on here?

BROWNLEE: Sir, a lot of our equipment has not been brought back yet. And we have provided for — I believe it's 17 systems, is that the number? That we would...

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, I think 15 systems reset.

BROWNLEE: That we have provided for, and it should get to the depot soon. I'm not sure why it hasn't.

Now, some of it we're going to have to do in theater because it's going to stay there.

SHELBY: Get back with me on the details of this. Will you get the details to me?

BROWNLEE: OK, sir. We'll do it.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I've got a...

SHELBY: General?

SCHOOMAKER: ... card here, if I could, on that. We requested and received \$1.2 billion in FY '04 supplemental funding for depot level resetting the force, above our PB '05 position. So this is going to be a massive effort.

And as I said, this effort will continue two years beyond the emergency as we reset the massive amount of equipment that we are...

SHELBY: To bring our equipment up to readiness status, though...

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir.

SHELBY: The S&T funding. General? In comparison to '04 funding, every R&D account but one goes down in '05 request. Basic research is cut \$64 million. Applied research is cut \$389 million. Advanced technology development is cut \$391 million. Advanced component development and prototypes is cut \$186 million. RDT&E management support is cut \$34 million. And operational systems development is cut \$167 million.

I'm not sure how the R&D program is balanced. I support FCS. But it seems that the budget is harmful to the Army's organic labs and this could be a problem, Mr. Secretary.

BROWNLEE: Sir, we actually — our R&D actually went up from fiscal year '04 to fiscal year '05...

SHELBY: But not in these specific programs.

BROWNLEE: Not in those specific accounts. And sir, we'll have...

SHELBY: R&D.

BROWNLEE: ... to take a look at them. I suspect also, because we had about \$1.2 billion in development funds for Comanche, much of which will now be directed into procurement, that that number's going to be adjusted when the budget amendment...

SHELBY: Would you look at these accounts? Take a second look at these.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, we will.

SHELBY: These organic lab accounts, I think they're important for the future.

I want to get — while I've got a little time hopefully — Space and Missile Defense Command. You're very familiar with that.

The SMDC technical center is managing the miniature kill vehicle program for MDA. What do you think of the MKV program and the technical center's role?

BROWNLEE: Sir, I don't know, I'll have to take it for the record...

SHELBY: You want to get back with us on this?

BROWNLEE: I will.

SHELBY: We've been told that the work's critical and the technology's badly needed in Iraq, you know. I don't know if this is the right forum to discuss all this.

BROWNLEE: I'm not sure either, sir. I'll be happy to take it for the record and...

SHELBY: Will you get back with me on this? And of course the PAC-3 needs transfer to the Army last year. There was apprehension in the Congress that the Army might use these funds to pay other bills. We met a couple of weeks ago with the reprogramming action. Could you get this to me, too?

BROWNLEE: What funds were these now?

SHELBY: Reprogramming action, needs. PAC-3 needs.

BROWNLEE: Sir, I'll look up...

SHELBY: Will you get back to us on the record on that?

BROWNLEE: You know, we greatly accelerated that program...

SHELBY: I know.

BROWNLEE: ... just before the war. And we were going to bring it back down to a more reasonable level, because we did really accelerate it just before the war, PAC-3.

SHELBY: If you'll discuss those with me.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SHELBY: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

STEVENS: Senator Cochran?

COCHRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Schoomaker, as a part of the announcement of the cancellation of the Comanche program, I understand the Army has decided to use unmanned aerial vehicles to fulfill some of the capabilities that Comanche was to provide and that you've identified over \$300 million from that program to procure additional legacy and future UAVs.

Given that the Fire Scout UAV has been selected to be part of your future combat system force, would the Army be served better by accelerating procurement of UAVs instead of buying more legacy systems?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, again, I'd have to take that for the record. I know that UAVs are a significant part of our future. And a growing part. Because the potential there is great.

And I know as we move to FCS, the Future Combat System, that they're going to be a large part of that.

As you know we've had some significant success with UAVs in the current conflict. We're starting to see greater potential in some of that. But as to the specifics of that, I would have to go for the record.

COCHRAN: I hope you would also include in your response for the record whether or not you think that the \$300 million is an adequate investment in advanced UAVs.

There is also a critical shortage of both training and war reserve ammunition. Such as the Hydra-70 rocket.

The decision to cancel the Comanche program and procure new helicopters will increase the need for training ammunition, and of course war reserve ammunition.

The question is, how does the Army plan to address these shortfalls, which we understand could be as high as \$16 billion?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, we moved \$30 million this year to increase the capacity of Lake City, which is your small-caliber, 0.50 caliber and below, small-arms ammunition, which is going to mitigate — I think by the end of this year we will have capacity that will turn the corner and mitigate the shortfalls we've had in small arms, which I've been very concerned about.

But as part of the Comanche program we moved \$155 million of that program as part of the aviation fix, to the Hydra rocket program. And I think it buys something like 163,000 Hydra rockets in this program. And \$93 million into the Hellfire line.

And this is the point I tried to make earlier. This movement of money from Comanche into fixing Army aviation isn't just about the helicopters. It's about UAV, it's about ammunition, it's about MILCON, it's about simulations, it's about training.

It's a holistic approach to fixing Army aviation. And the point that you've made right there is one of the most significant.

COCHRAN: Yes, thank you very much. I understand, too, the Army's been impressed by the performance of leased high-speed vessels, and is considering leasing these types of craft as theater support vessels. There's several American

shipyards capable of producing these vessels, both quickly and economically.

Based on what I understand to be successful experimentation, what are the Army's plans for procurement of theater support vessels?

BROWNLEE: Sir, we have been impressed by the capability of those vehicles. We are right now considering how they can help us in our deployments, and so we're studying how we could do that.

We do not have right now any plans to lease. But we are considering how that vehicle can be used. You know, it's much faster than a normal ship. And for some of our deployments we believe it would be very useful. So we're looking at that.

COCHRAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

STEVENS: Thank you.

Senator Leahy?

LEAHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, gentlemen, good to see you both, all of you. And you have a pretty impressive bench behind you.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, we need a lot of help.

(LAUGHTER)

LEAHY: No, no, I don't think so, but you have good help there. And that's good.

I understand that Secretary Brownlee mentioned before I came in about the Bradley reactive armor, and that you don't have enough. When I first heard about this reactive armor years ago, I said, "You got to be kidding," the way it's described.

Then I started seeing some of the tests and all, and I must admit I am very, very much of a fan. I think it is critical. I've heard great things about its performance, and I hope we can get the funds to expand it.

If my son or daughter were among those needing this armor I'd want it there yesterday. And some of our Guard forces that are going over into Iraq and scrounging armor wherever they can, I think it's important we get it out.

And, General, the Comanche program, General Cody had given me a call at home before that to let me know. Of course, I must admit we did end up chit-chatting a little bit about Montpelier, Vermont. And you're welcome to come up there any time.

And, Secretary, I should mention, General Richard Cody and I both come from Montpelier, Vermont, knew each other when we were growing up. We only say good things about each other because it's sort of a mutual deterrent pact.

(LAUGHTER)

Although I can't really think of anything bad to say about him.

But he told me about the Comanche program. I thought it was a good decision. I think it was bringing resources away from too many other very critical aviation programs. The infrared missile countermeasures, for example.

And let me just mention one — and I admit this is probably the first time any parochial-type questions have ever come out of this committee — but it's the HUMS program. The integrated mechanical diagnostic Health and Usage Monitoring System, which I'm glad my staff wrote it all out, because I've just called it HUMS and never was quite sure what it stood for.

But we're using it on the Black Hawks of the 101st Airborne Division. It's a great diagnostic system. I've seen it demonstrated.

If I was commander and I had 10 helicopters out there, I'd want to know exactly which of the 10 can go out, or how many can go out and so on.

Are we going to reach a point we might be equipping all our helicopters with HUMS? Are we going to be able to find money for that?

I see it sort of like cheaper to fix the roof before the rain storm kind of thing.

Mr. Secretary, what do you think about this?

BROWNLEE: Sir, I know we have an intense interest in those kinds of diagnostics maintenance equipment. It's of great use.

I'm not familiar with right now the extent with which we intend to buy those and equip all our helicopters with them, but we can certainly provide that for the record.

LEAHY: Yes, would you have your staff talk to mine? Let us know where we are on that. Because it is something I follow very closely. I've helped get some of the money through here for the pilot program. I've been impressed.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

LEAHY: I mean I've had some things (inaudible) get money for pilot programs, they haven't worked. I've freely admitted that. Others do, and this one does seem to work.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, if I could add to that, I think General Cody explained to you, again, as part of our Army aviation modernization program that as we transfer money from Comanche it's our intent to go to a two-level maintenance system in that, as well as going to the automated logbook on these aircraft.

And so I'm not sure that this system that you're talking about is integral to that. But we're certainly committed to a far advanced systems of maintenance management to increase our operational readiness and impact the force on the maintaining-wise.

LEAHY: Thank you, General.

And my last subject, I was up here three, four weeks ago in Vermont. A beautiful Sunday morning. Had my coffee.

My wife is a nurse who's worked on medical surgical floors and all, and has also spent time — started off with the VA hospital system when I was a law student. And she said, "Patrick, you've got to read this."

And it was this New York Times Magazine, "Coming Home." And it's basically talking about soldiers with post-traumatic disorder. I think in my generation we called it shell-shock. And it was a very moving article.

Since then I can't tell you the number of e-mails I've gotten from veterans, from parents of people who are over abroad, those who are parents of people in the military or spouses or whatnot sent me this article. And of course we have all the reports, the depression, suicide among our troops.

I went out with some other senators and my wife to have dinner one evening out at Walter Reed, and just some of the stories I was hearing there.

The condition requires specialized treatment. You have to have a system in there that will encourage troops to come forward. You're out there, you're facing terrible danger, you may get shot, you may be seriously wounded.

You've proven your bravery, and our men and women are brave. But then there seems to be among some that it's not brave to come forward and ask for the treatment. It's got to be there, you've got to make sure it's there. I'm going to be looking at it, both on this committee and on the subcommittee I serve on, the overseas, the VA.

But can you give me just a broad overview? What kind of programs do we have? Because I find the suicide rate alarming among our forces.

But I find that people come back terribly injured and I don't want them to be rejects of society. They've earned an awful lot more than that.

BROWNLEE: No, sir, I couldn't agree more. And I appreciate all of the members who have gone out and visited our troops at Walter Reed and other hospitals.

Clearly, the sacrifices that these young soldiers have made for our country are deserving of the very best attention we can give. And I've addressed your specific questions to those at Walter Reed. And this is an integral part of their care.

They receive this kind of care and counseling right along with the physical, medical part. And it is just clearly integrated in their care. And I've been very...

LEAHY: Is this budget going to reflect that?

BROWNLEE: Oh yes, sir. Yes, sir, it is.

I should also tell you that while the number of suicides in the theater has been more than is acceptable to us, it is not significantly above the norm. And there are still some cases that are not properly determined, and that could put us substantially — or more above the norm.

But we conducted for the first time in a combat theater a mental health assessment. We sent a team out, visited units, talked to soldiers, gathered data, and came back with some conclusions and recommendations for how we can better, not during the war or after the war, but before we send troops in. What we can do to prepare them better, as well as so that they can cope better with the situations that they face.

And I thought it was significant that that was done while the troops were committed there. But it's the first time we had ever done that.

LEAHY: Well, I commend you for doing that, Mr. Secretary. I think it's extremely important.

I mean we have — I know our men and women are motivated. But sometimes the things they face are something they really didn't understand.

I remember the conversations I had with my son after he finished at Paris Island with the Marine Corps. And of course like all former Marines, the further he's removed from that the more enjoyable I guess it was.

But at least there they always knew when the explosions were going off or anything else, that night or the next night or the next night, they're going to be back in their barracks. And the thing they had to worry about was their drill instructor.

Now we have people out and they're seeing their friends having their limbs blown off and all. They're facing real danger, which is unavoidable in these situations.

I just want to make sure that we fulfill our commitment — we tell them to go out, we fulfill our commitment when they come back.

And some of them — on the one hand I'm very impressed when I see some of these high-tech prosthetics we have for those who've lost limbs, it's really amazing. But you also have to have — it's not just their bodies, with some of them.

So I commend you for sending a team out. And please, have your staff keep in touch with me if you have areas in where you think that it'd be worthwhile to know.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, we will.

If I could just add, Mr. Chairman, because I'd like for the committee to know. When we first started getting wounded soldiers back to Walter Reed in significant numbers, and with the kind of very grievous wounds they had had where they'd clearly lost limbs and this sort of thing — where many of them were going to be medically retired as disabled — it's amazing at the numbers that want to stay in even though they have lost limbs. And some have stayed.

But I contacted Tony Principi, a dear friend of mine, who runs the Veterans Affairs department. We have put together a team.

We have people in his organization, he has people from his organization working at Walter Reed and other places. And the whole intent of this is to ensure we have a seamless system for these soldiers, so that if they are medically retired from the military, and then become part of the Veterans Affairs department responsibilities, nobody gets dropped off.

We take care of them through that, manage them through that process. And his intent and mine is to make sure for every single wounded soldier that is medically retired and becomes a part of the Veterans Affairs responsibility, that that is a seamless operation.

LEAHY: And I've gone over my time, but just say then, I talked to one young soldier there, his wife was with him, and a little child. And showing me this leg, a mechanical leg. And with the computer sensors in it and determine the fit.

I said, "What are you going to do now?"

He looks at me like, "What kind of a question is that, sir? I want to be right back in the Army." He said, "I'm going to work hard with them because I want to go back."

And I thought, "Good for you."

BROWNLEE: And many of them have, sir.

LEAHY: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. And it's good to see both General Schoomaker and Secretary Brownlee. Thank you.

STEVENS: Yes, we all thank you very much, Mr. Secretary and General. I do think that there's a lot of comment to be made around here now about how the Army's being harmed by these decisions that have been made, with regard to the budget.

And I want to say before we finish our bill we'll confer with you to make sure you have the flexibility you need, to use any funds that are available not just in the Department of Defense, but to the president period, to assure that there will be no shortfall in funds while we have our soldiers in the field.

Keeping in mind that from this senator's point of view, the worst thing that could possibly happen to the Army, as well as the Senate, is to have a post-election session. We get nothing done, and I assure you, you'll not getting any more money after the election than you'd get after January 1st.

But it would be a very arduous period in which to try to get it. I would like to avoid a post-election session in the interest of the people who are at war. We don't need that after the election.

I hope to work with you to make sure you have the money you need, and have all the flexibility you need. Thank you both very much.

(UNKNOWN): Thank you, sir.

BROWNLEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

END

**NOTES:**

[????] – Indicates Speaker Unknown

[—] – Indicates could not make out what was being said.[off mike] – Indicates could not make out what was being said.

**PERSON:** TED STEVENS (94%); ARLEN SPECTER (57%); THAD COCHRAN (57%); PETE V DOMENICI (57%); CHRISTOPH (KIT) BOND (56%); MITCH MCCONNELL (56%); KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON (55%); JUDD ALAN GREGG (55%); BYRON DORGAN (55%); RICHARD C SHELBY (55%); DANIEL K INOUE (54%); CONRAD BURNS (54%); ERNEST F HOLLINGS (53%); PATRICK J LEAHY (53%); ROBERT C BYRD (53%); TOM HARKIN (52%); RICHARD J DURBIN (52%); DIANNE FEINSTEIN (51%); HARRY REID (51%);

**LOAD-DATE:** March 8, 2004



107140

\*\*\*\*\* Print Completed \*\*\*\*\*

Time of Request: March 11, 2004 08:25 AM EST

Print Number: 1862:0:8355825

Number of Lines: 739

Number of Pages: 24

Send To: MAYFIELD, ALEX  
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU-PUBLIC AFF.  
1411 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-3231